

1  
2  
3 GOTHAM INSURANCE COMPANY,  
4 Plaintiff,  
5 v.  
6 SHASTA TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, et al.,  
7 Defendants.  
8

9 Case No. [13-cv-03810-BLF](#)  
10  
11

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S  
PHARMATECH SOLUTION INC.'S  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE  
UNDER SEAL PENDING  
DETERMINTION OF MOTION TO DE-  
DESIGNATE**

[Re: ECF 125]

12  
13 Before the Court is Defendant PharmaTech Solution Inc.'s administrative motion to file  
14 under seal the LifeScan Settlement Agreement and portions of its motion to de-designate the  
15 LifeScan Settlement that reference the settlement agreement. ECF 125. During discovery, Shasta  
16 Technologies produced a LifeScan Settlement Agreement. *Id.* at 4. Because the parties could not  
17 agree on the confidentiality of the settlement agreement, the settlement agreement was produced  
18 as "Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes Only." *Id.* Judge Grewal's December 7, 2015  
19 memorialized the parties' agreement and indicated that after reviewing the settlement agreement,  
20 if it was relevant to PharmaTech's litigation positions and defenses, PharmaTech could bring the  
21 appropriate motion to de-designate the settlement agreement. *Id.*  
22

23 PharmaTech has now brought a motion to de-designate the settlement agreement. ECF  
24 126-4. Since the settlement agreement was marked "Highly Confidential – Attorneys' Eyes  
25 Only," PharmaTech has also brought this motion to file under seal the settlement agreement and  
26 portions of its motion that reference the agreement even though it believes the settlement  
27 agreement should be de-designated. ECF 125. Shasta Technologies has filed a declaration in  
28 support of PharmaTech's motion to seal. ECF 128.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1        Courts recognize a “general right to inspect and copy public records and documents,  
2 including judicial records and documents.” *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d  
3 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). Two standards govern motions to seal portions of documents: a  
4 “compelling reasons” standard, which applies to dispositive motions, and a “good cause” standard,  
5 which applies to non-dispositive motions. *Id.* at 1179.

6        Since the confidentiality of the settlement argument is currently the subject of the motion  
7 to de-designate, the Court GRANTS PharmaTech’s motion to file under seal the settlement  
8 agreement and portions of its motion to de-designate the settlement agreement until the Court  
9 rules on PharmaTech’s motion to de-designate.

10      The parties also appear to request that they be allowed to file under seal opposition and  
11 reply briefs in connection with the motion to de-designate and redacted versions of the same  
12 without having to make separate administrative motions to seal. *See* Proposed Order at 2, ECF  
13 127. The local rules do not allow for a sealing order to cover prospective events. Should the  
14 parties wish to file future documents under seal, they must comply with the local rules.

15      **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16      Dated: January 27, 2016

17        
18      BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
United States District Judge

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28